

THEORETICAL APPROACH TO THE CORRELATIONS OF A HARD-SPHERE CRYSTAL

C. Rascón^{1,2}, L. Mederos², and G. Navascués¹

¹*Departamento de Física Teórica de la Materia Condensada, Universidad Autónoma, Cantoblanco, Madrid E-28049, Spain*

²*Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas), Cantoblanco, Madrid E-28049, Spain*
(February 1, 2008)

We present the first theoretical approach to the angular-average of the two-body correlation function $\tilde{g}(r)$ for simple solids. It is based on three sum rules for $\tilde{g}(r)$: the compressibility and virial equations and the normalization. We apply the theory to determine this correlation function for the case of the FCC solid phase of hard spheres. The agreement with simulation data is excellent over all the density range. The application to other simple systems is discussed. The approach opens a new route to perturbation theories for simple solids.

PACS numbers: 61.50.Ah, 64.70.Kb

The most important correlation function in fluid classical systems is the radial distribution function $g(r)$. The theoretical accessibility of this function for a hard-sphere (HS) fluid, namely the Percus-Yevick approximation, has been the crucial point to the extraordinary development of the theory of simple liquids [1,2]. The analogous progress is lacking in the case of structured phases of these systems, the solids. Spite of the advance in the theory of classical non-uniform systems experimented during the last fifteen years [3], one of the most important theoretical objectives, correlations, has remained unapproachable.

In structured systems the most important correlation is $\tilde{g}(r)$ the angular average of the two-particle density function $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. It appears in all crucial equilibrium equations as the virial and compressibility equations or the energy equation [2] and it is the key of all perturbation approaches [2-4]. The $\tilde{g}(r)$ plays the same rule in classical solids as $g(r)$ does in classical fluids. However, up to now, no theoretical approach to $\tilde{g}(r)$ has been reported. Here, we present the first theoretical approach to this function and apply it to evaluate $\tilde{g}(r)$ for a face-centred-cubic HS solid. The agreement with simulation results is excellent over all the physical range of densities from below melting up to almost close packing.

All previous theoretical approaches reported in the literature to the correlations of classical solids have been focused on $g(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ (defined through $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \equiv \rho(\mathbf{r})\rho(\mathbf{r}')g(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$) for HS and mainly in relation to perturbation schemes. These are not true approximations, rather, they are simple mappings to the radial distribution function of a uniform system at some effective density. None of these approaches can resist a direct comparison with simulation results [5]. In fact, these mappings

could be done over a wide family of functions [6]. Moreover, only $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ (the probability to find two particles at $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{r}'$) and $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')/\rho(\mathbf{r})$ (the probability to find a particle at $\mathbf{r}$ provided there is another one at $\mathbf{r}'$) and their angular averages have a direct physical meaning. Then it would be more sensible to make approximations on these functions than on $g(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. The function $\tilde{g}(r)$ is defined as

$$\tilde{g}(r) = \frac{1}{4\pi V \rho^2} \int d\Omega \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}), \quad (1)$$

where V is the volume, $\rho \equiv N/V$ is the mean density and $d\Omega$ the differential solid angle aperture around $\mathbf{r}$.

To motivate the new theory we shall first discuss the two types of correlations that $\tilde{g}(r)$ must accounts for in a solid. The long-range correlation characteristic of the structured phases is directly due to the periodicity of the solid. If no other correlation is considered each particle would move around a lattice site independently of each others. The probability of finding a particle at $\mathbf{r}$ is given by the local density $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ which is a sum of Gaussian-like functions located at each lattice site. Then $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is given by the simple product of individual probabilities $\rho(\mathbf{r})\rho(\mathbf{r}')$ multiplied by a step-like function, $g(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$, to avoid the double occupancy. Thus, the long-range correlation is *already* described by the product $\rho(\mathbf{r})\rho(\mathbf{r}')$. Its proper angular average gives the long-range contribution to $\tilde{g}(r)$. Then, it is convenient to define $\tilde{g}_0(r)$ as the angular average of the product $\rho(\mathbf{r})\rho(\mathbf{r}')$,

$$\tilde{g}_0(r) = \frac{1}{4\pi V \rho^2} \int d\Omega \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \rho(\mathbf{r}_1)\rho(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}), \quad (2)$$

which has the form of a sum of Gaussian-like peaks $\tilde{g}_0^{(i)}$ centred around successive neighbours distances R_i , normalized to the corresponding number of neighbours n_i . Then, if no other correlation than the long-range correlations imposed by the lattice is considered, $\tilde{g}^{(i)} = \tilde{g}_0^{(i)}$ for $i > 0$, and both functions are the same except that the first peak of $\tilde{g}_0(r)$ is excluded in $\tilde{g}(r)$. This long-range correlation is the only one existing in the close-packing limit of a HS solid. In this limit $\rho^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is exactly a sum of products of δ functions at any pair of different lattice sites multiply by a step-like function to exclude the double occupancy. Hence, the function $\tilde{g}(r)$ will be a sum of δ functions at different neighbours distances, except at zero distance, normalized to the corresponding number of neighbours.

To take into account other correlations the successive peaks $\tilde{g}^{(i)}$ must be increasingly modified from the $\tilde{g}_0^{(i)}$ as i decreases to 1. The compressibility equation [2]

$$4\pi\rho \int dr r^2 [\tilde{g}(r) - \tilde{g}_0(r)] = -1 + \rho k_B T \chi_T. \quad (3)$$

is a sum rule for $\tilde{g}(r)$ which help us to understand these modifications. The integral of $\tilde{g}_0(r)$ in Eqn.(3) gives the number of particles inside the system provided the origin is located at a lattice site. The integral of $\tilde{g}(r)$ gives the number of particles inside the system (minus one because of the self-exclusion) provided a particle is fixed at the origin. Thus the left hand side of Eqn.(3) can be understood as the number ΔN of particles (minus one) coming into the system when a particle is fixed at the origin, therefore $\Delta N = \rho k_B T \chi_T$. Observe that in the HS close-packing limit $\chi_T = 0$, the correlation reduces to the long-range one discussed above, hence $\tilde{g}^{(i)} \equiv \tilde{g}_0^{(i)}$ and Eqn.(3) is verified identically. In other words, no HS come into the system if it is completely packed. If we imagine a spherical system of radius R we can estimate ΔN as $\rho 4\pi R^2 \delta R$, where δR is the displacement of the peaks at the border of the system, *i.e.* the displacement of $\tilde{g}^{(i)}$ respect to $\tilde{g}_0^{(i)}$ for $R_i \approx R$. Then $\delta R \approx \rho k_B T \chi_T / (\rho 4\pi R_i^2)$. This is a quite interesting result which shows that the differences, which should include some kind of deformation, between $\tilde{g}^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{g}_0^{(i)}$ reduce quadratically with the distance.

Until here the discussion has been quite general and now we apply it to the case of a HS solid. The compressibility of the HS solid is so small that δR would be practically imperceptible in a simulation. A rough estimation of this displacement is already negligible for the first peak even at the lowest densities: taking $R \approx 1$ and $\rho k_B T \chi_T \approx 0.02$ give $\delta R \approx 0.001$ (distances in HS diameter units d_{HS}). Thus the location of the peaks of $\tilde{g}(r)$ does not differ from the localization of those of $\tilde{g}_0(r)$. If the displacement of the peaks is negligible it is quite sensible to assume that their functional form cannot differ significantly from the peaks of $\tilde{g}_0(r)$ except for the first one due to the characteristic cutoff of the HS.

Up to here we have described the subjacent physics which motivates the following theoretical approach to $\tilde{g}(r)$. Accordingly we approximate the peaks of $\tilde{g}(r)$ by those of $\tilde{g}_0(r)$ beyond nearest-neighbours. To go far toward an explicit form for these peaks, we can regard the existent functional theories [3] which give an accurate description of the free energy of a HS solid and from which it is possible to determine $\rho(\mathbf{r})$. All these theories use successfully the Gaussian parametrization of $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ [7],

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}_i} e^{-\alpha(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{R}_i)^2}, \quad (4)$$

where α is the Gaussian width parameter. Using Eqn.(4) into Eqn.(2) yields:

$$\tilde{g}_0^{(i)}(r) = \frac{1}{4\pi\rho} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} n_i \frac{e^{-\alpha(r-R_i)^2/2} + e^{-\alpha(r+R_i)^2/2}}{r R_i}, \quad i > 0. \quad (5)$$

For the sake of simplicity, we have dropped all terms which arise from the exponential products with $\mathbf{R} \neq \mathbf{R}'$ in (5). At the usual values of α they give negligible contributions because of the absence of overlapping.

The above discussion on the compressibility suggests for $\tilde{g}^{(1)}(r)$ a functional form similar to that of Eqn.(5). We propose the simple parametric form:

$$\tilde{g}^{(1)}(r) = \frac{A e^{-\alpha_1(r-r_1)^2/2}}{r} \quad r \geq d_{HS}, \quad (6)$$

with $\tilde{g}^{(1)}(r) = 0$ for $r \leq d_{HS}$. The compressibility shows that even in the less favourable case, at the lowest densities, the displacement of the first peak is quite small. This suggests that mean location of the nearest-neighbours $\langle r \rangle$ can be approximated by the mean value obtained with the first peak of $\tilde{g}_0(r)$:

$$\frac{4\pi\rho}{n_1} \langle r \rangle \equiv \int d\mathbf{r} r \tilde{g}^{(1)}(r) = \int d\mathbf{r} r \tilde{g}_0^{(1)}(r). \quad (7)$$

This equation is a sum rule for $\tilde{g}(r)$ becomes less approximate as the mean density increases and it is exact at the limit of close-packing. Besides two other *exact* sum rules must be obeyed by $\tilde{g}(r)$. The first one corresponds to the normalization of $\tilde{g}^{(1)}$ to the nearest-neighbours number:

$$4\pi\rho \int_{d_{HS}}^{\infty} dr r^2 \tilde{g}^{(1)}(r) = n_1. \quad (8)$$

The virial equation is the second *exact* sum rule. It can be easily proved that, for non-uniform systems, the pressure is related to the value of $\tilde{g}(r)$ at contact exactly in the same way as it is related to the radial distribution function of uniform fluids:

$$\beta P / \rho = 1 + 4\eta \tilde{g}(d_{HS}), \quad (9)$$

where $\beta = 1/k_B T$ and η is the packing fraction ($\eta = \pi\rho/6$).

All the required information to determine $\tilde{g}(r)$ (α and pressure as functions of ρ) is now provided by the minimization of any of the well known and accurate density functionals for the Helmholtz free energy of HS solid. With these data, the three proposed sum rules form a non-linear system of equations which is solved to find A , α_1 and r_1 at each ρ . Simultaneously, using α and Eqn.(5), the successive peaks of $\tilde{g}(r)$ are obtained. Very recent studies have shown that the equation of state of the HS solid deduced from different functional approaches agree quite well with simulation results over all the density range [8]. For the following calculation, we use the generalized effective liquid approximation (GELA) [9] as it

gives the best overall behaviour. However, there is not significant differences if any other functional approach is used. If we compare the most recent Monte Carlo simulations by Choi *et al.* [10] with the predictions of the present theory for $\tilde{g}(r)$, the agreement is excellent over all densities and specially impressive at high densities. Figures 1 and 2 show $\tilde{g}(r)$ for two significant densities: $\eta = 0.52$, the lowest density below melting ($\eta_m \approx 0.54$) with available simulation data, and $\eta = 0.71$, near close packing ($\eta_{cp} \approx 0.74$), respectively. There are some differences between theoretical predictions and simulation results. Nevertheless, they are quite small and can only be appreciated more easily at the lowest densities. Let us first pay attention on $\tilde{g}^{(1)}(r)$. The value at contact differs from that of simulation. It is a direct consequence, via virial equation, of the approximate theoretical pressure. If the *exact* pressure (from simulation) is used into the theory, the agreement with simulation would be almost complete (see figure 1) confirming the goodness of the theory. The rest of the peaks of $\tilde{g}(r)$, which only depends on the parameter α ($\alpha = 113$ for $\eta = 0.54$ and $\alpha = 10094$ for $\eta = 0.71$), also agree quite well with the simulation results. Introducing again the *exact* α values (estimated from simulation: $\alpha = 91$ for $\eta = 0.54$ and $\alpha = 7659$ for $\eta = 0.71$) the agreement is excellent. The Gaussian parameter α_1 is approximately half than those of the rest of the peaks ($\alpha_1 = 50$ for $\eta = 0.54$ and $\alpha_1 = 5405$ for $\eta = 0.71$). However, because the cutoff the width of this first peak is similar to the rest. The excellent agreement of the first peak showed in the inset of the figures would give an estimation of α_1 from simulation practically equal to that predicted by the theory. More interesting is the r_1 parameter, it corresponds to the position where the first peak has its practically maximum value. Notice, however, that at very low densities the real maximum is located at contact (see figure 1) and r_1 would be the maximum if the first peak is analytically extrapolated below $r = 1$. The important point is that simulation data of this maximum has been reported (at very low densities the extrapolation has been also reported). Figure 3 shows the these data for different densities together with the theoretical predictions.

According with the decreasing of the lattice parameter, the width of the first peak decreases monotonously with ρ (α_1 increases monotonously with ρ).

r_1 must be always smaller than the $< r >$ except at the close-packing limit where both coincide. As ρ decreases from this limit the pressure decreases rapidly from infinity and therefore the value at contact. Meanwhile the lattice parameter hardly changes and the peak width still remains quite sharp. under these circumstances the only way to keep on with the normalization is increasing r_1 . However, at low ρ , the pressure does not change too much with ρ and the peak becomes duller as ρ decreases, r_1 must recede to maintain the normalization. We remark this because the overall agreement of the peaks does not

necessarily implies the nice agreement of the behaviour of r_1 with the mean density. This proves the suitable physical description of our theoretical approach. The parameter A is a simple factor to adjust the normalization or to adjust the value at contact.

A major consequence of the theoretical knowledge of $\tilde{g}(r)$ is the possibility to develop and use proper perturbation theories for solids where the perturbative term uses the appropriate correlation function of the reference HS system instead of a the correlation of a fluid at same effective density [3]. Working along this direction is in progress. Moreover, these theories provide a way to determine $\tilde{g}(r)$ for any simple system in the same way as in theory of simple liquids where the HS system is used as reference system [2]. An alternative and fresh method is to apply directly the present approach. It can be proposed a parametric form of $\tilde{g}(r)$ which includes all the relevant physics. Extending the approach to systems with significant compressibility, the two parameters of each peak, α and R_i , should differ from their homologous of $\tilde{g}_0(r)$ in an amount which should decrease quadratically with the distance. The normalization and equilibrium equations should be enough to determine this decay and to reasonably describe $\tilde{g}(r)$. Notice that the energy equation is another sum rule which can be applied to these systems. The presence of defects, vacancies and interstitials, would change the normalization of the peaks, in both $\tilde{g}(r)$ and $\tilde{g}_0(r)$ which also would depend on the distance. For this contribution, however, one should expect an exponential decay as the defects would behave as a kind of fluid inside the solid which induce a short-range correlation into $\tilde{g}(r)$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank P. Tarazona for helpful discussions. This work has been supported by the Dirección General de Investigación Científica y Técnica of Spain under grant number PB94 – 0005 – C02.

-
- [1] J.K. Percus and G.J. Yevick, Phys. Rev. **110**, 1 (1958).
 - [2] J.P. Hansen and I.R. McDonald, *Theory of Simple Liquids* (Academic, New York, 1986).
 - [3] *Fundamentals of Inhomogeneous Fluids*, edited by D. Henderson (Dekker, New York, 1992).
 - [4] J. D. Weeks, R. L. B. Selinger, and J. Q. Broughton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2694 (1995).
 - [5] A. Kirdilis, and R. A. Brown, Phys. Rev. E, **47**, 427 (1993).
 - [6] L. Mederos, G. Navascués, and P. Tarazona, Phys. Rev. E **49**, 2161 (1994).

- [7] Attempts to improve the parametrization have shown the goodness of the Gaussian one (B. B. Laird, J. D. McCoy, and A. D. J. Haymet, J. Chem. Phys. **87**, 5449 (1987)). Simulations have shown that deviations from Gaussian form are only significant at low densities but only at the tails of the distribution (R. Ohnesorge, H. Löwen, and H. Wagner, Europhys. Lett. **22**, 245 (1993)).
- [8] A. R. Denton, N. W. Ashcroft, and W. A. Curtin, Phys. Rev. E **51**, 65 (1995) and C. F. Tejero, M. S. Ripoll, and A. Pérez, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 3632 (1995). Comparison between simulation results and other functionals in C. Rascón, L. Mederos and G. Navascués, submitted to Phys. Rev. E.
- [9] J. F. Lutsko and M. Baus, Phys. Rev Lett. **64**, 761 (1990).
- [10] Y. Choi, T. Ree and F.H. Ree, J. Chem. Phys. **95**, 7548 (1991).

FIG. 1. $\tilde{g}(r)$ at $\eta = 0.52$. Solid line is the prediction of the present theory using theoretical data from GELA functional approach. Dotted line corresponds to the theoretical predictions using data from a hypothetical exact theory. Triangles are Monte Carlo results from Choi *et al.*. The inset shows details of the first peak $\tilde{g}_1(r)$.

FIG. 2. As Figure 1. but for $\eta = 0.71$.

FIG. 3. Parameter r_1 (lower curve) and $\langle r \rangle$ for the first neighbour (upper curve) as a function of the mean density predicted by the theory. Triangles from simulation data.